

## Faulk, Camilla

---

**From:** Jeniece LaCross [jessecreerose@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 28, 2011 7:09 AM  
**To:** Faulk, Camilla  
**Subject:** Recording interviews

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to add my comments to the issue regarding the proposed rule to require recording of interviews. I am a trial criminal defense attorney and I think that this rule is necessary. By recording the interview it prevents any misunderstandings at trial. It removes the ambiguity of a persons "interpretation" of what was said. A recording of an interview is a way in which the evidence at trial can be made more clear to the jury. Here in Kitsap county where the prosecutors did not actively oppose recording and even go so far as telling the person being interviewed that they would also like the interview recorded because it makes a better record, most of my interviews are recorded and I have not experience a victim or witness claiming that the tape recorder added further trauma.

The only witnesses that I have ran into that have in issue about being recorded are the police officers. As they are public servants and are routinely involved in court matters I am continuously surprised why they would object to being recorded. In fact they see the benefits of recording because they routinely record confession from defendants.

I feel that it is crucial to be able to record interviews in order that the jury may have the best evidence possible and have not in my experience seen at all how a tape recorder traumatizes witnesses or victims.

Thank you for your consideration

Jeniece LaCross  
Attorney at Law  
WSBA# 28859